



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Robert C. Frame

§ Group Art Unit: 2673

AF/2673
2700
#32
4/12/02

Serial No.: 09/096,684

§ Examiner: Lao, L.

Filed: June 12, 1998

§ Atty Docket: COMP:0060/FLE
For: PORTABLE COMPUTER SYSTEM PD-25744

Assistant Commissioner
for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

MAR 19 2002

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date below:

March 4, 2002

Date

Carla Deblaw

Carla Deblaw

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.193

This Reply Brief is being filed in response to the Examiner's Answer, which was mailed on January 3, 2002.

The Appellant has carefully studied the Examiner's Answer and respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to make a persuasive case that the claims of the present application are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Specifically, the Appellant continues to respectfully assert that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in view of the Kikinis, Goodrich and Swafford references, because the Examiner has not properly demonstrated a suggestion that would have motivated one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of the references to obtain the claimed

invention. Instead, the Examiner has relied on improper hindsight to construct the rejections of the Appellant's claims.

Furthermore, the references cited by the Examiner do not render the Appellant's claims invalid even if the combination of references is proper. In the present case, modification of the cited references as suggested by the Examiner would destroy the intended purpose or function of the cited reference. Because functionality would be destroyed, such a modification could only be viewed as *undesirable*. Accordingly, the rejections of the Appellant's claims should not be allowed to stand. The Appellant respectfully requests favorable consideration by the Board in view of the remarks set forth below.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, Appellant requests that this and any future reply requiring an extension of time be treated according to the General Authorization For Extensions Of Time previously submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 4, 2002



Barry D. Blount
Reg. No. 35,069
FLETCHER, YODER & VAN SOMEREN
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(317) 867-2497